

REMARKS

At the time of the Office Action dated April 28, 2002, claims 13-18 were pending and rejected in this application. Claim 13 has been amended, and care has been exercised to avoid the introduction of new matter. Claim 13 has been amended to clarify that a conductive adhesive layer is formed on signal lines, consistent with Fig. 1 of Applicant's disclosure.

Claims 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) for lack of novelty as evidenced by Mertol, U.S. Patent No. 5,866,943

On page two of the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that Mertol discloses a method of manufacturing a package for accommodating electronic parts corresponding to that claimed. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Initially, Applicant notes that claim 13 has been amended to recite that a stiffener is adhered to signal lines with a conductive adhesive layer and that the conductive adhesive layer is formed on the signal lines. In the statement of the rejection, the Examiner asserted that element 24 discloses the claimed stiffer and element 36 discloses the claimed conductive adhesive layer. The Examiner also referred to column 8, lines 43-47 as disclosing the claimed signal lines. However, upon reviewing this citation, it is not clear what element in Mertol discloses the claimed signal lines. Notwithstanding this ambiguity, it is apparent that at least the bonding pad 32 of Mertol carries signal lines.

As discussed above, claim 13 now recites that the conductive adhesive layer is formed on the signal lines, and feature 36 of Mertol (the Examiner's asserted conductive adhesive layer) is

not formed on any signal lines. Thus, Mertol fails to identically disclose the claimed invention within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 102. Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that the imposed rejection of claims 13-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 for lack of novelty as evidenced by Mertol is not factually viable and, hence, solicits withdrawal thereof.

Applicant has made every effort to present claims which distinguish over the prior art, and it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance. However, Applicant invites the Examiner to call the undersigned if it is believed that a telephonic interview would expedite the prosecution of the application to an allowance. Accordingly, and in view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant hereby respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY

Scott D. Paul by M. Stear
Scott D. Paul
Registration No. 42,984
#26106 ✓

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
(202) 756-8000 SDP/GZR/AJS:kap
Date: July 28, 2003
Facsimile: (202) 756-8087